

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are pending and under consideration in the above-identified application. In the Office Action of January 16, 2008, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 were rejected. Claims 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14 were cancelled in a previous amendment and remain cancelled,

With this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8, 9, 11 and 12 are at issue.

### **I. 35 U.S.C. § 102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims**

Claims 1-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Yamada* et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 7,102,282). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In relevant part, each of the independent claims 1, 2, 8 and 9 recites:

“the materials and thicknesses of the first and second electrodes are selected such that outside light is reflected from the first and second electrode at substantially the same strength and approximately inverted phases.”

This is clearly unlike *Yamada*, which fails to disclose selecting the materials and thicknesses of the first and second electrodes such that outside light is reflected from the first and second electrode at substantially the same strength and approximately inverted phases. Instead, *Yamada* discloses that “reflection of external light H<sub>1</sub> in the wavelength range passing through the color filter 20 can be *prevented effectively* in the organic layer 13.” (See, U.S. Pat. No. 7,102,282, Col. 14, l. 3-5) emphasis added.

As the current application teaches, selecting the materials and thicknesses of the first and second electrodes such that outside light is reflected from the first and second electrode at substantially the same strength and approximately inverted phases provides improved image

quality by reducing the intensity of the reflected light. See, US Pub. 20040156405 Para [0064].

The light emitting device disclosed by *Yamada* is incapable of producing this desired effect.

Therefore, because *Yamada* fails to disclose, or even fairly suggest, every feature of claims 1, 2, 8, and 9, the rejection cannot stand. Because claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 depend, either directly or indirectly from claims 1, 2, 8, and 9, they are patentable at least for the same reasons.

**II. Conclusion**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all claims are clearly allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 7, 2008

By: /David R. Metzger/  
David R. Metzger  
Registration No. 32,919  
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000